



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,623	10/24/2003	Nitya Narasimhan	CS21925RA	8794
20280	7590	06/10/2009	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC 600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45 W4 - 39Q LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			HANNETT, JAMES M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2622	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/10/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

DOCKETING.LIBERTYVILLE@MOTOROLA.COM
ADB035@Motorola.com

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/692,623

Applicant(s)

NARASIMHAN, NITYA

Examiner

JAMES M. HANNETT

Art Unit

2622

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 April 2009.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☒ Claim(s) 16-30 is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2004 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 4/21/2009 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The applicant amended the claims to specify that the coverage capability of wireless media devices is a media coverage capability of wireless media devices. The applicant further argues that the prior art does not teach that the coverage capability is a media coverage capability. The examiner disagrees with the applicant. The examiner asserts that the term media is broad and does not specifically define the media type. Therefore, the examiner views the coverage capability of a wireless media device as a media coverage capability.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

- 1: Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by USPN 7,079,945 Kaplan.
- 2: As For Claim 1, Kaplan teaches on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 a display of a wireless communication device for providing guidance about monitoring devices (cell phone towers) within a surrounding area (geographic area of map), the display comprising: a central cell representing an area of the wireless communication device (

area vehicle is currently in); and a plurality of surrounding cells representing areas surrounding the wireless communication device (adjacent areas of coverage see Figure 9), each surrounding cell having an appearance representing to a media coverage capability of wireless media devices within the respective surrounding cell.

3: In Regards to Claim 2, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein each surrounding cell (region of coverage) includes a first color if the coverage capability is below a particular threshold value (service of no service), and each surrounding cell includes a second color if the coverage capability is at or above the particular threshold value.

4: As For Claim 3, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein each surrounding cell (region of coverage) has a first appearance if a quantity of wireless media devices is below a particular threshold value, and each surrounding cell has a second appearance if the quantity of wireless media devices is at or above the threshold value.

5: In Regards to Claim 4, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein the central cell (current location indicated in Figure 9) has a default appearance representing a default coverage capability of the wireless communication device within the central cell.

6: As For Claim 5, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein the central cell and the plurality of central cells form a symmetric grid on the display.

7: In Regards to Claim 6, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 A wireless communication device for providing guidance to a user about surrounding conditions comprising: a device discovery mechanism (navigation system receives data related to coverage areas) configured to identify surrounding devices (cell towers) in a vicinity of the wireless communication device (navigation system); a processor, coupled to the device discovery mechanism (navigation system), configured to determine a coverage capability for each area surrounding the wireless communication device based on the surrounding devices (cell tower capabilities) in each area; and a display (230), coupled to the processor, configured to visually provide a representation of the media coverage capability of each area surrounding the wireless communication device.

8: As For Claim 7, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein the coverage capability of each area surrounding the wireless communication device (current location) is determined based on a quantity of surrounding devices (cell transmitters) in each area.

9: In Regards to Claim 8, Kaplan teachers on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein the coverage capability of each area surrounding the wireless communication device

(navigation system) is determined based on a capability of surrounding devices in each area.

10: As For Claim 9, Kaplan teaches on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein the display differentiates between areas having differing coverage capabilities.

11: In Regards to Claim 10, Kaplan teaches on Column 5, Lines 20-45, Column 10, Lines 15-45 and Column 11, Lines 1-25 and depicts in Figures 9 and 10 wherein the display provides a central cell (current location) representing an area of the wireless communication device (navigation system) and a plurality of surrounding cells representing the areas surrounding the wireless communication device.

12: As For Claim 11, Claim 11 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 6, since Claim 6 is substantively equivalent to Claim 11.

13: In Regards to Claim 12, Claim 12 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 7, since Claim 7 is substantively equivalent to Claim 12.

14: As For Claim 13, Claim 13 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 8, since Claim 8 is substantively equivalent to Claim 13.

15: In Regards to Claim 14, Claim 14 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 9, since Claim 9 is substantively equivalent to Claim 14.

16: As For Claim 15, Claim 15 is rejected for reasons discussed related to Claim 10, since Claim 10 is substantively equivalent to Claim 15.

Allowable Subject Matter

17: Claims 16-30 are allowed.

The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter:

The prior art does not teach A communication server for receiving data feeds from cooperative wireless devices within a particular area comprising: a network interface configured to receive at least one data feed associated with a location of a first wireless device; a processor, coupled to the network interface, configured to associate each data feed with an area adjacent to the first wireless device; and a display, coupled to the processor, configured to visually provide a plurality of surrounding cells representing areas surrounding the first wireless device, at least one surrounding cell showing a data feed of the at least one data feed, each data feed being provided by a second wireless device located in an area corresponding to the respective surrounding cell.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to James M. Hannett whose telephone number is 571-272-7309. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 am to 5:00 pm M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Chan can be reached on 571-272-3022. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/James M. Hannett/
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2622

JMH
June 8, 2009